



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/791,831

03/04/2004

Daniel Ledermann

250031US2

3854

22850

7590

05/25/2011

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

THOMAS, JASON M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2423

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/25/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/791,831	LEDERMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JASON THOMAS	2423	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 7-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 8, 2011 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed March 8, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to "recite features related to the recording instructions that include... digital rights management [DRM] information that includes access rights for the corresponding program." (see pg. 6). In support of this amendment, as it relates to recording instructions that include DRM information, Applicants recite "non-limiting support in Applicants' disclosure as originally filed, for example... at page 11, lines 5-12" (see pp. 6-7). The examiner has included this relied upon portion below:

The functions of the access control module 111 are designed according to so-called digital rights management (DRM).

Art Unit: 2423

If a user would like to obtain from the system 1 the television signals stored in digital format and have them shown on his terminal 2, 2', 2'', he transmits a corresponding request with the respective access right and an identification of the television signals stored in digital format to the system 1, where it will be received by the playback module 11 and further processed.

As a result, applicants argue that neither Mizutani, Christopoulos, Perlman nor Solomon teach that, "the recording instructions include digital rights management information that includes access rights for the program to instruct the controlling central unit to select and store the television signals in the digital format" (see pp. 9-10). The examiner disagrees with this assertion and is also unable to find support for this newly amended recitation in the disclosure as originally filed or in the relied upon portion of the specification (i.e. pg. 11, ll. 5-12).

More specifically, while Perlman and Solomon are teaching references which have been added to make up for the deficiencies of Mizutani but not intended to teach the act of sending recording instructions, Mizutani teaches including digital rights management (DRM) information in the form of user identification information which enables the system to determine user authorization and access preventing other users from accessing a recorded file (see e.g. [cols. 2-3, ll. 55-20], [col. 7, ll. 26-36]).

Furthermore, while the portion relied upon by Applicants is referring to DRM and the corresponding access rights, it is only referring to rights which are provided to enable playback at the viewer terminal and not rights which are included in the "recording instructions" (see pp. 10-12, ll. 24-2). According to the relied upon portion of the specification, the "request" transmitted by the viewer to obtain from system 1

Art Unit: 2423

the stored television signals is not a recording request comprising "recording instructions", as suggested by the amended claims, because the television signal requested has already been stored in system 1. Rather, the "request" is simply a request to playback a television signal which has already been recorded (i.e. stored). Moreover, the examiner can not find any support in the disclosure as originally filed which suggest that "DRM information", as defined in the specification, is included in the recording instructions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-3 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to "recite features related to the recording instructions that include... digital rights management [DRM] information that includes access rights for the corresponding program." (see pg. 6). In support of this amendment, as it relates to recording instructions that include DRM information, Applicants recite "non-limiting support in Applicants' disclosure as originally filed, for

example... at page 11, lines 5-12" (see pp. 6-7). The examiner disagrees that the disclosure as originally filed contains such support. (see Response to Arguments).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, (U.S. Pat. No. 7,003,791 B2) in view of Christopoulos et al., (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047517 A1), Perlman, (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0184637 A1) and Solomon, (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0070174 A1).

Regarding claim 1: Mizutani discloses a system for recording and playback of television signals from a plurality of television channels, comprising: a storage unit 105 (alternatively 29); a computer-based controlling central unit 98 (alternatively 13 or 15), connectible to a telecommunication network 17; a plurality of television receivers 121-123 (alternatively 23-27 or 101), each connected to the controlling central unit and configured to receive television signals 31 on one of the television channels; a plurality of coding modules 131-135 (alternatively encoders resident in network server 15), connected to the television receivers, configured to code the received television signals into a digital format 127; an instruction unit (14, 15 (i.e. where the server inherently has a processor) or 97 for a processing device for

Art Unit: 2423

processing instructions), connected to the controlling central unit, configured to receive and store recording instructions from users via the telecommunication network, the recording instructions including a user identification of a mobile terminal, electronic programming guide information identifying a program to be recorded of the television signals (i.e. a channel number, recording timing), digital rights management (DRM) information (i.e. user identification information which enables the system to determine user access) and quality parameters, and configured to instruct the controlling central unit to select and store the television signals in the digital format on the storage unit corresponding to the program identified by the electronic programming guide information of the recording instructions and based on the quality parameters, and configured to assign the user identification to the selected television signals and to store the user identification together with the television signals on the storage unit (see e.g. [abstract], [cols. 2-3, ll. 55-20], [col. 5, ll. 26-55], [col. 6, ll. 20-49], [col. 7, ll. 9-15]); and a playback module 107 (where the network access interface reads on a playback module in that it provides the client device the ability to play back content which has been recorded) configured to generate access right keys based on the digital rights management information (i.e. where the user identification is used to enable the system to determine user access of selected media), and to transmit the television signals stored in the digital format on the storage via the telecommunication network for playback to a display terminal 11 (alternatively 13) associated with the user, the display terminal being identified by a network address that is linked to the user

identification assigned to the respective stored television signals of the storage unit (see e.g. [cols. 2-3, ll. 55-20]).

Mizutani teaches allowing the user to make a selection indicative of parameters associated with the respective display terminal (see e.g. [col. 6, ll. 20-33]) but is silent regarding the act of transmitting the television signals in a format dependent upon the quality parameters and the access right keys (which suggest that some modification of the signal from its stored format has been made).

Christopoulos teaches an analogous system which provides media from a server to users upon request, based on information in the form of “hints” which indicate user preferences, client capabilities and/or network capabilities (i.e. quality parameters). These “hints” are obtained by the server to enable transcoding which provides “format fitting” media based on the user preferences and capabilities (see e.g. [abstract], [0002], [0033], [0035], [0038-0039], [0046]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the recording instructions of Mizutani, by including information which indicates the network capabilities, as taught by Christopoulos, in order to better meet the needs of users based on each client device and network capability, thereby better meeting each users specific viewing needs.

Perlman teaches an encryption system which encrypts a video signal prior to storage (see [57], [59]), an access control module configured to generate access rights which are transmitted via the network to authorized users (see [58]), and a playback module for transmitting the encrypted data to the user (see [61]). Therefore

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the controlling system which delivers content to end users of Mizutani, by providing a means of encryption and decryption, as taught in Perlman, when providing a means to transmitting video across a network as instructed by users, as taught in Jones, because this prevents unauthorized users from viewing video content (see [57]). Pearlman is not explicit on who is able to receive the protected content.

Solomon however teaches a system where authorized users are able to receive content in a format which enables the content to be displayed (see [40], [65], [73]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of modifying the encrypted content, as taught by Solomon, by limiting access to the decrypted content only to the users who are authorized and who have decided to receive and view particular content.

Regarding claim 2: The combined teachings of the aforementioned art disclose wherein the controlling central unit is configured to transmit, in accordance with the stored recording instructions, control signals to one of the connected television receivers for activation of the respective television receiver and/or for selection of a television channel on the respective television receiver based on the channel number (see e.g. Mizutani [cols. 11-12, ll. 66-35] where a controlling device inherently controls the activation or deactivation of the selected receivers to enable simultaneous control or alternatively using only a single receiver when multiple programs are not being aired simultaneously).

Regarding claim 11: The combined teachings of the aforementioned art disclose wherein the plurality of television receivers and the plurality of coding modules are configured to receive and record television signals from different channels in parallel at the same time for two different users from said users (see e.g. Mizutani [cols. 4-5, ll. 66-8], [cols. 5, ll. [26-55], [cols. 11-12, ll. 66-35]).

Regarding claim 14: The combined teachings of the aforementioned art disclose wherein the quality parameters include information on display resolution of the respective display terminal, and transmission speed of the communication network to the respected display terminal (see Mizutani e.g. e.g. [col. 6, ll. 20-33] ; see also Christopoulos e.g. [abstract], [0002], [0033], [0035], [0038-39], [0046]).

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, in view of Christopoulos, Perlman, Solomon and Jones et al., (CA 2,321,462 A1).

Regarding claim 3: While the aforementioned art teaches wherein the telecommunication network is a network based on Internet protocol, and the playback module is further configured to transmit the television signals, stored in the digital format (see e.g. Mizutani [fig. 1, 17], [col. 7, ll. 9-15]) there is no mention of using a streaming mode via the telecommunication network to the display terminal associated with the user.

In analogous art however, Jones teaches using a streaming mode to relay content to end users (see e.g. [pg. 7, ll. 1-11], [pg. 9, ll. 15-22], [pg. 13, ll. 20-23], [pg. 22-23, ll. 22-7] for using an IP stream). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

transmission mechanism of Mizutani, by providing a means for IP streaming, as taught by Jones, in order to provide more efficient means of distributing the video content to end users.

5. Claims 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, in view of Christopoulos, Perlman, Solomon and Fingerman et al., (U.S. Pat. No. 7,143,430 B1).

Regarding claim 7: While Mizutani teaches wherein the controlling central unit is further configured to transmit, after successful storing of the television signals, in accordance with the stored recording instructions, an electronic ready notification via the telecommunication network to the mobile terminal of the user whose user identification is assigned to the respective recording instructions (see e.g. [claim 83]) but fails to teach wherein the notification is a message.

Fingerman teaches sending notifying the end user upon completing a recording via message (see e.g. [col. 3-4, ll. 66-5]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the notification of Mizutani, by instead using a message, as taught by Fingerman, in order to provide an alternate means of indicating to the user that his/her content is ready for viewing..

Regarding claim 8: While Mizutani teaches wherein the controlling central unit is further configured to erase automatically television signals, after a defined period of time after their storage (see e.g. [col. 3, ll. 43-56]) the combined teachings are silent regarding wherein the controlling central unit is set up to transmit

Art Unit: 2423

automatically, before the automatic erasing, an electronic warning signal via the telecommunication network to the mobile terminal of the user whose user identification is assigned to the respective stored television signals.

Fingerman teaches providing the user with a warning when stored content will be deleted prior to deleting said content (see [fig. 8], [col. 10, ll. 33-41] for an electronic warning). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the deletion procedure of Mizutani, by warning the end user prior to deletion, as taught by Fingerman, in order to provide the end user with the option to delete programs that are not desired rather than losing valued content.

Regarding claim 10: While Mizutani teaches wherein the controlling central unit and the playback module are each implemented on different computers connected to one another, the controlling central unit and/or the playback unit including memories for storing the television signals coded in the digital format (see e.g. [figs. 1, 7, 17] where both the server and client have storage devices for storing digital content) the combined teachings of the aforementioned art fail to teach wherein the television receivers are configured to receive digital and/or analog television signals via cable television networks and/or via television antennas for terrestrial television broadcasting or satellite television transmission.

Fingerman teaches using various delivery systems for distributing content to end users which include satellite, cable TV, broadcast TV and CCTV (see e.g. see Fingerman [col. 5, ll. 12-18], [col. 9, ll. 27-44]). Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit: 2423

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the distribution means of Mizutani, by providing multiple modes of distribution, as taught by Fingerman, in order to provide alternative means for receiving desired programming.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, in view of Christopoulos, Perlman, Solomon and Ellis et al., (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0149988 A1).

Regarding claim 9: The combined teachings of the aforementioned art do not teach wherein the controlling central unit is further configured to store only once, jointly assigned to the user identifications of the respective plurality of users, television signals, which have been received at a time and on a television channel which are identified through consistent recording instructions from a plurality of users.

Ellis teaches the concept of a media server which stores a single copy of a program for multiple clients to simultaneously play back after being recorded (see [fig. 6a], [20], [90-96]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the storage procedures of Mizutani, by only storing a single copy which can be used to provide access to multiple users, as taught in Ellis, when providing a storage server to record media to be viewed at a later time, as taught in Jones, because this saves the amount of storage space used for multiple of users by reducing the amount of duplicate media to be saved by each user.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, in view of Christopoulos, Perlman, Solomon and Slotznick, (U.S. Pat. No. 7,058,356 B2).

Regarding claim 12: The combined teachings of the aforementioned art do not teach sending an electronic message in the form of an email to a client but do not teach wherein the ready message is a short message sent to a mobile device by the users.

Slotznick teaches a mobile (terminal) device (see [fig. 1c]) which can receive transmissions such as e-mail and internet access (see [cols. 15-16, ll. 63-9]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a mobile (terminal) device capable of receiving messages, as taught in Slotznick, when providing a means of communicating through e-mail messages to media users of such a device, as taught in combined teachings, because this allow the viewer to be notified of the completion of a recording when the user is remotely located with respect to their viewing device (see [abstract]).

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, in view of Christopoulos, Perlman, Solomon and Mensch, (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0133824 A1).

Regarding claim 13: The combined teachings of the aforementioned art do not teach wherein the instruction unit is further configured to extract the user identification of the mobile terminal by using at least one of an international mobile subscriber identity IMSI or a call number.

Mensch teaches wherein a customer can be identified by the cell phone from which they call (see [16], [18]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use identifying information from a mobile device, as taught in Mensch, to extract and identify a user to properly process the user's recording request, as taught in the combined teaching, because when communicating with a network using a mobile device sufficient information is captured during the communication process necessary to identify a person requesting entertainment for the mobile devices which all have unique numbers such as a cell phone (see [16]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Thomas whose telephone number is (571) 270-5080. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs., 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571) 272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2423

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J. Thomas

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423